UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE at CHATTANOOGA

GOODMAN PROPERTIES, INC.,)	
d/b/a The Goodman Company,)	
)	
<i>Plaintiff(s)</i> ,)	
)	Case No. 1:11-cv -334
v.)	
)	Judge Mattice
GREG L. BLOSSER, and 153)	Magistrate Judge Lee
CHATTANOOGA NORTH LLC,)	5
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

ORDER

Plaintiff Goodman Properties, Inc., ("Goodman"), has filed a Motion for Default Judgment against Defendants Greg L. Blosser and 153 Chattanooga North LLC. (Doc. 19). The Court referred the Motion for Default Judgment to Magistrate Judge Susan K. Lee for a report and recommendation on Defendants' liability for the causes of action in Plaintiff's complaint and the amount of damages, including attorneys' fees and costs, due to the Plaintiff as a result of Defendants' liability for such causes of action. (Doc. 21).

Magistrate Judge Lee conducted an evidentiary hearing in this matter on November 9, 2012, and on November 13, 2012, she filed her report and recommendation pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b). (Doc. 25). Magistrate Judge Lee recommended that Plaintiff be awarded judgment against Defendants in the following amounts: (1) the principal amount of \$518,000.00; (2) pre-judgment interest through November 9, 2012 in the amount of \$218,452.11; (3) attorneys' fees and expenses in the amount of \$8,957.98; and (4) post-

judgment interest at the statutory rate pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1961. (Id. at 3). Neither party has filed objections to the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation.¹

After reviewing the record, the Court agrees with Magistrate Judge Lee's report and recommendation. The Court hereby **ACCEPTS** and **ADOPTS** Magistrate Judge Lee's findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommendations pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Rule 72(b). Plaintiff's Motion for Default Judgment (Doc. 19) is hereby GRANTED.

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 58(a), the Court will set forth a separate document entering judgment in favor of Plaintiff against Defendants.

SO ORDERED this 3rd day of January, 2013.

/s/ Harry S. Mattice, Jr. HARRY S. MATTICE, JR. UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

factual or legal conclusions, under a de novo or any other standard, when neither party objects to those findings"). Taking into account the three additional days for service provided by Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(d), the period in which the parties' could timely file objections expired on November 30, 2012.

¹ Magistrate Judge Lee specifically advised the parties that they had 14 days in which to object to the Report and Recommendation and that failure to do so would waive the parties' respective appellate rights. (Doc. 25 at 3 n.2); see Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2); see also Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 148-51 (1985) (noting that "[i]t does not appear that Congress intended to require district court review of a magistrate's